UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/761,959	01/17/2001	Along Lin	B-4085 618515-9	5890

7590 06/08/2004	

Richard P. Berg
c/o LADAS & PARRY
21st floor
5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90036

EXAMINER
TRAN, TONGOC

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/761,959	LIN, ALONG
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tongoc Tran	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _17 January 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-9_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-9_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _5_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to applicant's application serial no. 09/761959

filed on 1/17/2001.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 1/17/2001 has been

considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Intel Corporation's "Common Data Security Architecture Specification", Draft Release

1.2, March 1997 (hereinafter Intel).

In respect to claim 1, Intel discloses a security architecture for a computer

platform comprising at least one data processor and at least one memory means said

architecture comprising:

an applications layer (200) for containing a plurality of user security applications

(see page 4, Fig. 1, Applications);

a layered services layer (201) for containing a plurality of security services

protocols (see page 4, Fig. 1, Layered Service Tools);

a language interface adapter, and tools for policy and model authoring or the like;

a common security services manager (CSSM) layer (202) comprising a

plurality of security services management means (203-208), a set of integrity

services, a policy interpreter, a manager of security contexts, and a plurality of

interfaces (209-214) for interfacing with add-in security modules (216-221); and

an add-in security modules layer (215) capable of accepting a plurality of add-in security

modules (216-221) implementing a set of standard security services (see page 4, Fig. 1,

CSSM Security API and Security Add-in Modules);

characterized in that said architecture comprises;

a generic trust policy library (217) supporting a set of standard trust policy

Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) and some functions dealing with trust

policy description files (see page 112, 4.1 Overview see page 9, 1.7.3.2);

a trust policy description file (223) containing a set of domain-specific trust

policies written in a policy language common to said architecture (see page 4,

Fig. 1, and page 9, 1.7.3.2); and

a policy interpreter (224), said policy interpreter operating to interpret a set of

policies contained in said policy description file (see page 9, 1.7.3.2).

In respect to claim 2, Intel discloses the architecture as claimed in claim 1,

characterized in that at least one of said plurality of said management means (203-208)

is provided with a corresponding respective policy description file determining the

policies with which said at least one management means operates (see page 112, 4.1, 4.1.1. and 4.1.2).

In respect to claim 6, Intel discloses the architecture as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that said common security services manager layer (502) is provided with its own policy description file (520) for implementing policies in that layer (see page 112, 4.1, 4.1.1. and 4.1.2).

In respect to claim 7, Intel discloses the architecture as claimed in claim1, characterized in that said applications layer (500) is provided with an applications layer policy description file (540) for determining policies to be implemented in said applications layer (see page 13, Fig. 3, page 11-page 14).

In respect to claim 8, Intel discloses the architecture as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that said layered services layer (501) is provided with a layered services layer policy description file (506) for determining policies followed by said layered services layer (see page 6, 1.7 and 1.7.1).

In respect to claim 9, Intel discloses the architecture as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that at least one of said plurality of add-in security modules (216, 218-221) is provided with a corresponding respective policy description file determining the policies with which at least one add-in security module operates (see page 4, Fig. 1, page 9, 1.7.3.2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Intel in

view of Sweitzer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,018,617).

In respect to claim 3, Intel discloses the architecture as claimed in claim 1. Intel

does not explicitly disclose but Sweitzer discloses a set of policy and model authoring

tools allowing a user to create said policy description file implementing a set of user

specified domain specific policies for controlling said computer platform (see Sweitzer,

col. 4, lines 5-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sweitzer's for

generating a set of policy and model authoring tools with the teaching of Intel's domain

specific add-on policy module for the benefit of creating generalize expressions of a

problem (Sweitzer, Abstract).

5. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Intel in view of Mukherjee, (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,415).

In respect to claim 4, Intel discloses the architecture as claimed in claim 1. Intel

does not explicitly disclose but Mukherjee discloses using PROLOG to generate policy

description file in a rule-based expert system (see col. 5, lines 1-16). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

implement the teaching of Mukherjee's using PROLOG to generate policy description

file with the teaching of Intel's domain specific add-on policy module for the benefit of

PROLOG's rule-based and natural language ability so that rules can be written in a

natural language that allow business rules to be specified in ordinary English

(Mukherjee, col. 5, lines 3-6).

In respect to claim 5, Intel discloses the architecture as claimed in claim 1. Intel

does not disclose but Mukherjee discloses a policy interpreter comprises a PROLOG

inference engine (see col. 2, lines 19-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching

of Mukerjee's PROLOG inference engine with the teaching of Intel's policy interpreter

for the benefit of using the inference engine to drive a graphical user interface and to

avoid redundant and unnecessary information from the graphical user interfaces and

permit changes to the user interface without relying on "hardcoded" software

(Mukherjee, col. 2, lines 19-24).

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

"Common Security Services Manager, Application Programming Interface (API)

Draft for Release 1.2 March 1997 discloses the architecture the specification of the third

layer, CSSM.

-Hayne discloses adaptively transforming data from a first computer program for use in a second computer program.

-Vasudevan et al. Disclose system and method to support varying maximum cryptographic strength for common data security architecture (CDSA) Applications.

-Engel discloses in "Programming for the Java Virtual Machine" chapter 13, method for Implementing PROLOG.

-Bosch discloses relational database compiled/stored on a memory structure providing improved access through use of redundant representation of data.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-7690. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory A. Morse can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner: Tongoc Tran

Art Unit: 2134

TT

May 18, 2004

MATTHEW SMITHERS

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 2137